

UMPQUA LAND EXCHANGE PROJECT

Report to Congress
June 2002

Foundation for
Voluntary Land
Exchanges



Oregon/Washington Bureau of Land Management
& the Foundation for Voluntary Land Exchanges

UMPQUA LAND EXCHANGE PROJECT

REPORT TO CONGRESS

JUNE 2002

INTRODUCTION

On October 11, 2001, the President signed into law Public Law 106-291 -- the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2001. Section 349 of Public 106-291 contained specific language and appropriated dollars for the continuance of the Umpqua Land Exchange Project (ULEP, or the Project). Specifically, Section 349 directs the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), in cooperation with the Foundation for Voluntary Land Exchanges (Foundation) to study the potential effects that different land ownership patterns in the lower Umpqua River Basin would have on the ecology and economics of the region.

ULEP is exploring opportunities for voluntary changes in the "checkerboard" pattern of public and private land in the Coast Range portion of the Umpqua Basin. The study area includes approximately 675,000 acres in the lower Umpqua River Basin, almost all of it in Douglas County, Oregon. Within this study area, the BLM and the U.S. Forest Service administer approximately 292,000 acres, of which a portion may be considered for exchange with privately owned acres of equivalent value.

The environmental review process now under way is the result of Public Law 106-291 that provided \$4.3 million to the Foundation to produce a "land ownership adjustment plan" and prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to analyze the potential impacts of any proposed land exchanges. If a thorough environmental analysis shows potential ecological benefits and the BLM and other affected landowners agree to proceed,

ULEP could ultimately result in voluntary land exchanges. Land exchanges could potentially consolidate fragmented ownerships, provide additional protection for lands with high ecological values, and allow private landowners to focus their management on lands more suitable for commercial timber production.

In this study the Foundation and the BLM are using a particular geo-spatial Multi-Resource Land Allocation Model -- commonly referred to as the "Model." This innovative computer model developed for ULEP allows comparison of effects on fish, wildlife habitat, timber production, watershed health, and other values under a variety of different land ownership scenarios. If the study concludes that a different ownership pattern is in the best interests of the federal government, then the new pattern would be implemented by land exchanges between the federal agencies (BLM and/or the U.S. Forest Service) and private parties on a voluntary basis.

In addition, if the BLM and the private landowners agree to participate in the exchanges, a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) will be prepared (in coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service) to ensure protection of listed or proposed threatened or endangered species found on lands that would be transferred to private ownership.

BACKGROUND

The Umpqua Land Exchange Project originated with a concept put forward in 1994 by Aaron Jones,

Smith River Falls formed a partial barrier to fish passage in the lower Smith River until the 60s when ODFW built a fish ladder.



UMPQUA LAND EXCHANGE PROJECT

REPORT TO CONGRESS

JUNE 2002

owner of the Eugene-based Seneca Sawmill Company. Jones envisioned a “friendly swap” between the federal government and private timberland owners in the Umpqua Basin that would maintain the timber supply from both private and federal lands while increasing habitat for wildlife. This would be accomplished in part by the voluntary transfer of ecologically sensitive private lands to federal ownership in exchange for federal lands considered more suitable for commercial timber production. Backed by funding from Jones, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and other private sources, the Umpqua Land Exchange Project began in 1994. Congress authorized federal funding for the project under the Oregon Resource Conservation Act of 1996. Specifically, the Oregon Resource Conservation Act of 1996 directed the Project to:

“Identify general or specific areas within the basin where voluntary land exchanges could promote consolidation of forestland ownership for long-term, sustained timber production; protection and restoration of habitat for plants, fish, and wildlife (including any federally listed threatened or endangered species); protection and restoration of wetlands, riparian lands, and other environmentally sensitive areas; consolidation of land ownership for improved public access and a broad array of recreational uses; and consolidation of land ownership to achieve management efficiency and reduced costs of administration.”

To date, Congress has appropriated approximately \$6,050,000 for the development of ULEP. What

follows is a chronological accounting of the monies that have been appropriated:

- *Public Law 104-333 -- the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996, appropriated \$200,000 and authorized \$2,000,000. \$195,000 of this was granted to the World Forestry Center in Portland, Oregon, for the purposes of a study on ULEP.*

- *Public Law 104-208, the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act of 1997, appropriated \$750,000. Of this amount, \$678,000 was granted to the World Forestry Center.*

- *Public Law 105-83, the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1998 appropriated \$800,000. Of this amount, \$784,000 was granted to the World Forestry Center.*

- *Public Law 106-291, the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2001, appropriated \$4,300,000. This money was appropriated to complete a plan and preparatory work necessary to begin exchanges within the Project area.*

THE MULTI-RESOURCE LAND ALLOCATION MODEL

In 1995, an independent science team began preparing a “Multi-Resource Land Allocation Model” to help evaluate potential land exchanges. The computer model was originally tested in 1998 on a 100,000-acre portion of the Umpqua watershed and subjected to an independent scientific peer

Photo
Near the upper headwaters of Smith River and boundary of ULEP.
illustrates checkerboard ownership being considered in ULEP.



UMPQUA LAND EXCHANGE PROJECT

REPORT TO CONGRESS

JUNE 2002

review. Based on that peer review, numerous changes have been made to the model. Combined with computerized mapping technology known as Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and basin-wide data on ownership, vegetation, streams, topography, timber volume, fish and wildlife habitat, roads, erosion hazards and other information, the model is one analysis tool that will be used to assess the economic and ecological effects of changes in land ownership over a variety of scales and time periods.

Fundamental to the methodology of the model was the development of an objective function of four groups defining habitat for species at risk. These four groups include *wildlife, watershed processes, fish, and plants*. In addition to the creation of ecological subgroups, the model also includes a series of mapping rules for each species, watershed indicators, ecological responses to the changes in vegetation, and other physical measures of the environment. These mapping rules also contain a landscape component that considers how each parcel of land relates to neighboring land in meeting the habitat needs of certain species.

Also important is the consideration of various management prescriptions for the land. The Foundation conducted a survey of all public and private land owners to determine what the intention was for each parcel of land. The public land managers contributed information regarding guidelines for management under the Northwest Forest Plan, and the private industrial and nonin-

dustrial owners submitted information regarding expected age, rotation, and thinning of certain stands of timber.

The environmental review portion of the ULEP process will build upon this innovative computer model developed for ULEP that allows comparison of effects on fish, wildlife habitat, timber production, watershed health, and other values under a variety of different land ownership scenarios. A plan will be developed for making the computer model publicly available for additional land exchanges or other purposes upon completion of the exchanges.

Model Chronology

1995 -- A consulting science team was assembled and began to prepare a draft study plan to examine the Umpqua Basin.

Spring 1996 -- The draft study plan received outside review and analysis.

August 1996 -- The study plan was finalized.

September 1996 -- A pilot study of the area began to examine approximately 100,000 acres in the Umpqua Basin.

November 1996 -- The President signed into law Public Law 104-333, Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996, that directs the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to assist ULEP's efforts to study eight specific areas.

Pre-commercial thinning in North Fork Soup Reserve (LSR) -- 15-year-old-stand



UMPQUA LAND EXCHANGE PROJECT

REPORT TO CONGRESS

JUNE 2002

October 1997 -- The consulting science team presented its preliminary results.

November 1997 -- The President signed Public Law 105-83, Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1998, appropriating \$800,000 to ULEP for the purposes of finalizing the pilot study, conducting peer review of the model, and developing a basin-wide vegetation layer for the model.

January 1998 -- Pursuant to Public Law 104-333, Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996, ULEP submitted a report to Congress detailing findings about the model.

October 2000 -- The President signed into law Public Law 106-291, the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2001, that provides \$4.3 million to the Foundation to produce a "...land ownership adjustment plan" and prepare an EIS to analyze the impacts of any proposed land exchanges.

EMERGENCY ACQUISITION PROCESS

In addition to the requirement that the BLM and the Foundation begin to analyze the potential for voluntary land exchanges, Public Law 106-291 also required the BLM to identify those parcels of land, within the project area, that were threatened by development. Specifically, Section 349(b) of the Act notes:

"In preparing the Plan, the Secretary shall identify, no later than March 31, 2001, those

lands or interests in land with willing sellers which merit emergency purchase by the United States due to critical environmental values or possibility of imminent development."

In early February 2001, the BLM mailed a pamphlet to approximately 5,500 post office box holders, rural route customers, and other interested parties. The pamphlet was designed to inform individuals living in the project area about the project and also to inform them about the emergency acquisition phase of the project, pursuant to Section 349(b). In addition to the distribution of the pamphlet, the BLM also issued a *Federal Register* Notice (**OR-932-1330-PC-010H:GP1-0086**) and worked with several local newspapers to help prepare stories about the emergency acquisition phase of the project.

Emergency Acquisition Ranking Process

Concurrent with this outreach process to the community, the BLM began to develop a ranking process to assess those parcels nominated for emergency acquisition. Specifically, the BLM created four criteria that had to be met prior to a parcel of property being considered or ranked:

-There is no current indication of opposition from current owner(s) to federal acquisition of the property.

-Evidence exists that activities on private property, as permitted under current state and/or local government regulations, result in loss of Critical Environmental Values (CEV). CEV may exist

One of many BLM fish passage culvert replacement projects in the ULEP project area.



UMPQUA LAND EXCHANGE PROJECT

REPORT TO CONGRESS

JUNE 2002

when the particular environmental component is indispensable, i.e., where its loss or destruction would likely be irreversible for decades and the component is recognized by state or federal authorities as threatened, endangered, or a species of concern. Maintaining water quality or riparian values critically important to these species or to public drinking water supplies may qualify as CEV. Other environmental values of a similar indispensable nature may qualify as CEV.

-The property presents no known health/safety/liability problems (e.g., hazardous waste contamination, unsafe structures, or significant road or slope failures) and management access exists.

-Public acquisition is consistent with the mission of the BLM and applicable land use plans.

In response to the pamphlet and other BLM outreach activities to the community, the BLM received 23 nominations for the emergency land acquisition phase of the project. While there were two parcels of land among the 23 nominations that contained special characteristics, there were no parcels that met enough of the ranking criteria to be considered for emergency acquisition.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT -- SCOPING PROCESS

Scoping is a process required in the early stages of preparing an EIS to encourage public participation and solicit public input to determine the scope of issues to be addressed and to identify

significant issues relating to the proposed action (CEQ Regulations, 40 CFR 1501.7). Comments received during scoping help provide a basis for the development of alternatives to be considered by the agency in the development of the EIS.

The public input component of the scoping process for ULEP began with publication of a Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* on July 9 and continued through August 8, 2001. Approximately 130 people attended one or more of the five scoping meetings held in western Oregon during the public scoping period. Meetings were held in Reedsport on July 16 (two meetings), Roseburg (July 17), Drain (July 18), and Eugene (July 19).

Dozens of comments were recorded at the scoping meetings, and 54 comment letters (27 e-mails and 27 mailed or hand-delivered) and 87 copies of a form letter were received during the public scoping period.

The comments were compiled and sorted into one of four broad categories:

- Alternatives to be Considered**
- Significant Issues to be Addressed**
- Other Issues to be Assessed**
- Issues Beyond the Scope of the EIS**

ULEP Website

In order to ensure that all interested parties have access to ULEP-related material, the BLM and the Foundation created a website for the project. Specifically, the website contains information



UMPQUA LAND EXCHANGE PROJECT

REPORT TO CONGRESS

JUNE 2002

related to the BLM/Foundation Assistance Agreement, the Scoping Process, and the Model, as well as a series of other documents related to ULEP. The website can be accessed at:

<http://www.or.blm.gov/umpqua>

Purpose and Need

The proposed action is an outgrowth of the Northwest Forest Plan to deal specifically with the checkerboard ownership pattern found in Southwest Oregon. In 1994, the Northwest Forest Plan provided management guidance for 24 million acres of federal lands from the Pacific Ocean to the crest of the Cascades and from the Canadian border through Northern California. One of the most difficult areas to plan for was Southwest Oregon due to the checkerboard ownership pattern found there. The lands in this area are comprised of alternating 640-acre sections of private and public land ownership, which create environmental, economic and administrative challenges for all landowners, public and private.

In order to alleviate the problem of checkerboard ownership, Congress directed (in the 1996 Oregon Resources Conservation Act) the pilot studies which eventually led to the development of the Multi-Resource Land Allocation Model. In the 2001 Interior Appropriations Act, in order to fully implement the Northwest Forest Plan, Congress directed the Foundation to create a land exchange plan utilizing the Model.

Incumbent within the proposed action are amendments to site-specific land management allocations of the Coos Bay, Eugene, and Roseburg District Resource Management Plans, and the Siuslaw National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. The Northwest Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines will not be amended as part of the proposed action. The purpose of the EIS is to evaluate the effects of a proposed land exchange plan on fish, wildlife, habitat, timber production, watershed health, the local economy, and other values. Alternative exchange plans will be analyzed in the EIS, as well as a "no action" alternative. The EIS is intended to inform the Secretary of Interior's decision regarding whether to execute the land exchange plan or one of the identified alternatives. The proposed action will be designed to:

- identify individual land exchanges between the government and willing landowners that will improve habitats for species at risk while maintaining timber values on private and public lands;
- improve the implementation and achieve the goals of the standards and guidelines in the Northwest Forest Plan through adaptive management in order to maximize their (standards and guidelines) benefits and efficiencies; and
- identify landowners that are willing to participate in an exchange.

Edge of Oxbow Burn, second-growth forests. Typical checkerboard. Older stands have heavy marbled murrelet occupancy.



UMPQUA LAND EXCHANGE PROJECT

REPORT TO CONGRESS

JUNE 2002

Specifically the goals and objectives of the proposed action are to:

-improve conditions for fish and/or wildlife habitat by improving the extent, distribution, and quality (for example, increasing connectivity of fragmented habitat patches) of late-successional reserves;

-protect and/or restore a healthy forest ecosystem with habitat that will support populations of native species and include protection for riparian areas and waters;

-protect and/or restore threatened, endangered, or proposed species' habitats;

-improve management efficiency and reduce administration costs on public and private lands in the planning area;

-maintain a sustainable supply of timber and other forest products that provides stability to the local and regional economies and contributes valuable resources to the national economy on a predictable and long-term basis;

-increase certainty of a sustainable timber harvest on private and public lands; and

-maintain, to the greatest extent possible given the goals discussed above, public access to and recreational opportunities on public lands.

NEXT STEPS

Upon completion of the scoping process, the BLM and the Foundation staff began work on developing alternatives, writing existing conditions and trends, and analyzing the effects of the alternatives. The anticipated date for public release of the Draft EIS is August 2002. The next step in the process will be the development of a plan examining:

- the non-federal lands or interests in land in the lower Umpqua Basin which, with the concurrence of willing non-federal landowners, are recommended for acquisition or exchange by the United States;

- the federal lands or interests in land in the lower Umpqua Basin recommended for disposal into non-federal ownership in exchange for the acquired lands of equal value; and

- specific land exchanges or purchases to implement the plan.

The U.S. Department of Treasury released federal funds to the Foundation on April 10, 2001, allowing BLM and the Foundation to finalize an Assistance Agreement that outlines the work of the Project. Specifically, this Assistance Agreement allows for the collection and validation of data for the geo-spatial model, draft and final EISs, biological assessments, and the potential creation of HCPs. All work will meet federal standards, and the BLM will have final authority over the content of all products and documents.

Scenic view of Umpqua River showing checkerboard land ownership pattern and agricultural bottom land.



UMPQUA LAND EXCHANGE PROJECT

REPORT TO CONGRESS

JUNE 2002

Model Validation

In model validation, the first step was to validate the vegetation data input. During a validation process with private forest companies in late 2000, the Foundation learned that its vegetation data input contained certain inaccuracies. The BLM met with the Foundation in April and May, and we mutually agreed to use another vegetation coverage and to modify the model. We have also agreed to a sample process, which should be completed shortly, to validate whether this alternative vegetation coverage is sufficiently accurate.

The second step of the validation process is to validate the model's other outputs for environmental effects which are dependent upon the vegetation component, both for the model's representations of current conditions and its predictions of future conditions. A series of validation meetings (including the Foundation and the BLM, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Forest Service, and the National Marine Fisheries Service) have been held over the last year.

The Foundation is currently making improvements to the model based on the findings of the validation process and continues to modify its components that estimate environmental effects. The Foundation also is working with the BLM to complete the validation process.

CONCLUSION

There are a number of issues that need to be resolved as the BLM and Foundation work together on ULEP. The Oregon/Washington BLM is committed to moving ahead with the Foundation to work on these issues as we implement the direction set forth in Public Law 106-291. Ultimately, the ULEP's success will depend on strong intergovernmental working relationships with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Forest Service.

Property on north side of Umpqua River west of Scottsburg, Oregon. Nominated for "Emergency Acquisition" but the parcel did not meet ranking criteria.



UMPQUA LAND EXCHANGE PROJECT

REPORT TO CONGRESS

JUNE 2002

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

The Oregon/Washington BLM has assigned several managers to oversee the Project, that include:

Elaine Zielinski, the BLM Oregon/Washington State Director

Sue Richardson, Coos Bay BLM District Manager

Cary Osterhaus, Roseburg BLM District Manager

Ed Shepard, Oregon/Washington BLM Deputy State Director of the Division of Resource Planning, Use and Protection

Pat Geehan, ULEP Project Manager

THE FOUNDATION FOR VOLUNTARY LAND EXCHANGES

The Foundation is a non-profit organization that was established in March 2000 to administer the Project in cooperation with the BLM. The Foundation's board of directors includes representatives of the Oregon Department of Forestry, Douglas County, the World Forestry Center, the wood products industry, and a nationally recognized environmental organization.

Foundation for Voluntary Land Exchanges Board of Directors and Managers include:

Aaron U. Jones, President and Founder, Seneca Sawmill Company

Doug Robertson, Chairman Douglas County Commissioners, and President of the Association of O&C Counties

James E. Brown, Oregon State Forester

Bruce Taylor, Defenders of Wildlife

John L. Blackwell, Former Executive Director of the World Forestry Center.

Marc Kelley, Foundation for Voluntary Land Exchanges, Director

Rob Gill, Foundation for Voluntary Land Exchanges, Operations Director and Project Manager

40-year-old stand in North Fork Soup Creek Late Successional Reserve.



ULEP Public Information and Educational Outreach

Since the beginning of 2001, ULEP has been conducting outreach that has included individual briefings with local and Washington, D.C., Congressional staff, Douglas County Commissioners, U.S. Forest Service, National Marine Fisheries, cities of Roseburg and Reedsport staff, Douglas Timber Operators, Small Woodland Owners, Umpqua Basin Watershed Council staff, State of Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, the Soil and Water Conservation Service, Umpqua Watershed Council, Douglas County and Coos County economic development organizations, local and regional environmental organizations, recreation groups, and various timber interests.

- Presentation to the Southwest Oregon Provincial Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting in Roseburg -- **April 10, 2001**
- Update to Southwest Oregon PAC meeting in Medford -- **June 5, 2001**
- Briefings with the News Review -- Roseburg, Eugene Register Guard, Coos Bay World, The Drain Enterprise, The Umpqua -- Reedsport -- **Summer 2001**
- Briefing with George Smith and Tribal Organizations -- **July 16, 2001**
- Briefing for the Umpqua Basin Watershed Council Technical Committee and model demonstration -- **August 2, 2001**
- Update to Umpqua Basin Watershed Council Board -- **August 21, 2002, September 18, 2001 and November 20, 2001**
- Briefing for Douglas Timber Operators (Roseburg) -- **September 13, 2001**
- Distributed copies of the Technical Appendices of the Model to libraries in Roseburg, Drain, Yoncolla, and Reedsport -- **Fall 2001**
- Briefing for the Douglas Small Woodland Owners Board -- **October 2, 2001**
- Speech at the Roseburg Chamber of Commerce -- **October 15, 2001**
- Presentation to Oregon State University, Oregon Department of Forestry/Oregon Forest Resources Institute Conference in Corvallis -- **October 22, 2001**
- Hosted evening meeting of Small Woodland Owners to inform about project -- **November 6, 2001**
- Hosted breakfast for Small Woodland Owners -- **November 7, 2001**
- Briefing Rotary Reedsport -- **November 15, 2001**
- Speech to Society of American Foresters, Coos Bay Chapter -- **November 15, 2001**
- Briefing Douglas Timber Operators (Coos Bay) -- **November 16, 2001**
- Briefing hosted by Bruce Taylor for the Portland-area conservation organizations -- **November 19, 2001**
- Speech and educational workshop for the Douglas County Board of Realtors -- **January 22, 2002**
- Update at Douglas, Jackson, Josephine County Forest Service Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) in Grants Pass -- **January 31, 2002**
- Speech to Society of American Foresters, Jackson County Chapter -- **February 19, 2002**
- Update to O&C Counties Association, Board of Directors, Roseburg -- **February 21, 2002**
- Briefing Douglas County BLM RAC -- **February 25, 2002**

UMPQUA LAND EXCHANGE PROJECT

REPORT TO CONGRESS

MARCH 2002

PUBLIC LAW 106–291—OCT. 11, 2000

114 STAT. 1003

(1) **COMPENSATION AND TRAVEL.**—Members of the advisory group who are not officers or employees of the United States, while attending conferences or meetings of the group or otherwise engaged in its business, or while serving away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(2) **ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT.**—The NETL shall furnish to the advisory group clerical and administrative support.

(3) **PROCEDURES AND REQUIREMENTS.**—In carrying out its functions, the advisory group shall comply with the procedures and requirements that apply to similar groups providing advice and counsel to entities operating other Department of Energy laboratories rather than the procedures and requirements that apply to such a group providing advice directly to a Federal entity.

SEC. 349. (a) In furtherance of the purposes of the Umpqua Land Exchange Project (ULEP) and previous Congressional appropriations therefor, there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$4,300,000 to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Such amount shall be available to the Foundation for Voluntary Land Exchanges (“Foundation”) working in conjunction with the Secretary of the Interior, and with the U.S. Bureau of Land Management as the lead Federal agency, to complete a Final Land Ownership Adjustment Plan (“Plan”) for the area (“Basin”), comprising approximately 675,000 acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled “Coast Range-Umpqua River Basin,” dated August 2000. No more than 15 percent of this appropriation shall be used by the agency for defraying administrative overhead.

(b) In preparing the Plan, the Secretary shall identify, no later than March 31, 2001, those lands or interests in land with willing sellers which merit emergency purchase by the United States due to critical environmental values or possibility of imminent development. For lands or interests in land so identified, the Secretary and the Foundation shall arrange with landowners to complete appraisals and purchase clearances required by law so that the Secretary may thereafter consummate purchases as soon as funds therefor are appropriated by the Congress.

(c) Pursuant to the funding and direction of subsection (a), the Secretary shall, in cooperation with the Foundation, no later than December 31, 2002, complete the Plan utilizing the Multi-Resource Land Allocation Model (“Model”) developed for the ULEP. The Plan shall identify: (1) non-Federal Lands or interests in land in the Basin which, with the concurrence of willing non-Federal landowners, are recommended for acquisition or exchange by the United States; (2) Federal lands or interests in land in the Basin recommended for disposal into non-Federal ownership in exchange for the acquired lands of equal value; and (3) specific land exchanges or purchases to implement the Plan. In addition, no later than December 31, 2002, the Secretary, in cooperation with the Foundation, shall complete a draft Habitat Conservation Plan (“HCP”) covering the lands to be disposed of by the United States and consistent with the Plan, a comprehensive Final Environmental Impact Statement covering the Plan, and a comprehensive Biological Opinion analyzing the net impacts of the Plan at Plan scale over time in 5 year increments, taking into consideration

Deadline.

UMPQUA LAND EXCHANGE PROJECT

REPORT TO CONGRESS

MARCH 2002

114 STAT. 1004

PUBLIC LAW 106-291—OCT. 11, 2000

all expected benefits to be achieved by the Plan and HCP, and any consistency determinations or amendments to any applicable Federal land management plans. The HCP shall cover all species analyzed in the Model (including species under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce).

Deadline.

(d) No later than March 31, 2002, the Secretary and the Foundation shall submit to the Committee on Resources of the U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate, and the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, a joint report summarizing the Plan and the land exchanges or purchases identified to implement the Plan, and outlining: (1) any Fiscal Year 2003 funding needed for land purchases; (2) any recommendations for actions to expedite or facilitate the specific land exchanges or purchases identified to implement the Plan, or the HCP; and (3) an action Plan for making the Model publicly available for additional land exchanges or other purposes upon completion of the exchanges.

Deadline.

(e) No later than June 15, 2003: (1) the Secretary with the Foundation and the financial participation and commitment of willing private landowners shall complete appraisals and other land purchase or exchange clearances required by law, including those pertaining to cultural and historic resources and hazardous materials; and (2) the Secretary shall consummate with willing non-Federal landowners the specific land exchanges previously identified in subsection (c) to implement the Plan, and together with the Secretary of Commerce, shall issue the HCP.

SEC. 350. Notwithstanding section 351 of section 101(e) of division A, Public Law 105-277, the Indian Health Service is authorized to provide additional contract health service funds to Ketchikan Indian Corporation's recurring budget for hospital-related services for patients of Ketchikan Indian Corporation and the Organized Village of Saxman.

Boise Laboratory Replacement Act of 2000.

SEC. 351. (a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Boise Laboratory Replacement Act of 2000”.

(b) FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) the existing facilities of the Rocky Mountain Research Station Boise laboratory are outdated and no longer serve as a modern research facility;

(B) the Boise laboratory site is in the heart of a Boise city redevelopment zone, and the existing laboratory facilities detract from community improvement efforts;

(C) it is desirable to colocate the Boise laboratory with 1 of the State institutions of higher learning in the Boise metropolitan area—

(i) to facilitate communications and sharing of research data between the agency and the Idaho scientific community;

(ii) to facilitate development and maintenance of the Boise laboratory as a modern, high quality research facility; and

(iii) to reduce costs, better use assets, and better serve the public; and

(D) it is desirable to make the Boise laboratory site available for inclusion in a planned facility that is being developed on adjacent property by the University of Idaho

[illegible]